

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

These remarks are made in response to the Office Action of February 3, 2009 (Office Action). As this response is timely filed within the 3-month shortened statutory period, no fee is believed due. However, the Examiner is expressly authorized to charge any deficiencies to Deposit Account No. 14-1437.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §§ 102 & 103

Claims 1 and 4-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 7,020,696 to Perry, et al. (hereinafter Perry). Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perry in view of Microsoft Computer Dictionary. Claims 8 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perry with reference to the Background section of the present invention.

Although Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejections, Applicant has amended Claim 1 to even more clearly define the present invention and to facilitate prosecution of the instant application. Claims 27-28 have been added. The claim amendments and the added claims are fully supported by the original disclosure and no new matter has been introduced.

Aspects of Applicants' Invention

It may be helpful to reiterate certain aspects of Applicants' invention prior to addressing the cited references. One embodiment of the invention, as typified by amended Claim 1, is a computer-implemented method for customizing a display of system services within an administrative interface.

The method can include categorizing the system services into functional categories based on functions of the system services; and establishing a plurality of system service profiles based on functional roles of users. Each system service profile represents a

customized subset of the system services.

The method also can include detecting a request for the presentation of system services from a user; ascertaining an identity of the user and at least one functional role associated with the user; determining at least one of the system service profiles corresponding to the at least one functional role of the user; determining at least one system service to be displayed in accordance with the at least one determined system service profile; and displaying the determined at least one system service within the administrative interface in a manner that the determined at least one system service is navigable based on the functional categories of the determined at least one system service, the at least one determined system service profile corresponding to the user, and computing devices providing the determined at least one system service.

See, e.g., Specification, paragraphs [0028] to [0034]; see also Figs. 2-4.

The Claims Define Over The Prior Art

It was asserted in the paragraph bridging pages 6 and 7 of the Office Action that Perry breaks down each network device into groups of services based on their functions. When a network device is selected, a series of tabs are displayed to the user. Each tab corresponds to a particular function of the network device. Perry discusses a System tab, Modules tab, Ports tab and SONET Interface tab. Each tab can be accessed in order to allow an administrator to view and modify the data. See Perry, col. 21, line 54 through col. 23, line 26, for explanation of the displayed tabs.

In Perry the System tab data as well as the Modules tab, Ports tab and SONET Interface tab data all represent physical aspects of the network device. They are not the functional categories based on functions of the system services in the sense of the present invention. It is noted that in the present invention the functional categories are not based on physical aspects of a particular network device, but rather on functions of system services provide by all system devices. The examples of functional categories according

to the present invention can include printer, e-mail, storage, and the like (see, e.g., Fig. 4; see also Specification, paragraph [0033]: “The navigation selection 405, however, can include category navigation items based upon functional categories, such as printer, e-mail, storage, and the like.”).

Therefore, Applicant submits that Perry does not disclose categorizing system services into functional categories based on functions of the system services, as recited in independent claims of the instant application.

The amended independent Claim 1 as well as the added independent Claims 27-28 further recite that the determined at least one system service is displayed within the administrative interface in a manner that the determined at least one system service is navigable based on the functional categories of the determined at least one system service, the at least one determined system service profile corresponding to the user, and computing devices providing the determined at least one system service. As can be seen in Figs. 3-4 and explained in Specification, paragraphs [0030]-[0034], the system services can be displayed in a way that the system services can be navigated based on the functional categories of the system services (for example, “Printer,” “Email,” “Storage,” and “Misc” in Fig. 4), the system service profiles corresponding to the user (for example, “Print Operator” and “Email Operator” in Fig. 3 and “Administrator” in Fig. 4), and computing devices providing the system services (for example, “Server 425,” “Server 430,” “Client 435,” and “Peripheral 440” in Fig. 4). This limitation is not disclosed by Perry.

Accordingly, Perry fails to disclose or suggest each and every element of Claims 1 and 27-28. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that Claims 1 and 27-28 define over the prior art. Furthermore, as each of the remaining claims depends from Claim 1 while reciting additional features, Applicants further respectfully submit that the remaining claims likewise define over the prior art.

Applicants thus respectfully request that the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 & 103 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicant believes that this application is now in full condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested. Applicant requests that the Examiner call the undersigned if clarification is needed on any matter within this Amendment, or if the Examiner believes a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of the subject application to completion.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 4, 2009

/Gregory A. Nelson/
Gregory A. Nelson, Registration No. 30,577
Yonghong Chen, Registration No. 56,150
NOVAK DRUCE & QUIGG LLP
Customer No. 40987
525 Okeechobee Boulevard, 15th Floor
West Palm Beach, FL 33401
Telephone: (561) 838-5229